

dead hand of government off the backs of the private sector results in explosive economic growth. The evidence of this is irrefutable as countries around the world throw off the shackles of protectionism, high tariffs, and trade barriers, to the great benefit and enrichment of their people.

The United States is the most desirable market in the world. I understand why countries seek to gain ever better access to our market through trade agreements.

And no one has been a bigger supporter over the years of breaking down trade barriers worldwide than I have.

But Mr. President, a responsible, sober trade policy for America is not measured by the number of trade agreements we conclude with the rest of the world.

A responsible, sober trade policy for America is measured by the benefit to the American people, to the American worker, and the American family.

Mr. President, another concern that I have, and that Republicans generally have, with fast-track relates to our experience during approval of the two previous trade agreements.

This administration has promised that it will add extraneous issues, such as labor and environment and maybe other issues, to any trade agreement it negotiates. I believe that linking trade to the agendas of worker rights and environmentalist activists would be a serious mistake and in the end would harm working Americans.

Mr. President, I supported the NAFTA and GATT agreements because I support increased trade and opening foreign markets to U.S. goods and services.

However, I did not support the way in which this administration used, and some would say abused, the fast-track procedures for those trade bills.

The fast-track rules were the result of an agreement between the Congress and the President. The President agreed to consult with the Congress regularly and in depth on the details of trade agreements under negotiation. In return, Congress agreed to give up the right to amend legislation implementing a trade agreement after its submission to the Congress, and further agreed to consider the implementing legislation in a limited time concluding with an up-or-down vote, without amendment.

The fast-track rules were crafted to provide a sensible way for negotiating the elimination of trade barriers with other countries. The purpose of requiring considerable consultation between the President and the Congress was to arrive at a consensus on the content of an acceptable agreement. If you did that, you did not need a lot of amendments. That was the original intent.

The fast-track rules were never meant to operate as a vehicle for matters that lay well outside any consensus.

Fast-track was never meant to be a vehicle for matters on which there was fundamental disagreement.

The fast-track procedures were used effectively for a long time. Through four administrations trade agreements were negotiated and submitted to Congress under fast-track rules, and the process worked pretty well.

But when the Clinton administration arrived, this changed.

Despite warnings from Republicans, then in the minority, the administration insisted on labor and environment side agreements accompanying the NAFTA. We opposed these side deals for a simple reason: linking trade to other issues like these winds up hurting us more than others.

Now the President has stated that if Congress gives him fast-track authority, he is committed to extending these labor and environment provisions to other countries in any trade agreement he concludes with them.

Mr. President, this is unacceptable. We cannot and must not burden our trade relationships with the agendas of any number of special-interest groups. The President seems to want to use fast-track once again to advance interests other than trade. We must not permit that to happen.

During the GATT debate, we had a similar experience. Despite numerous warnings from Republicans, the President submitted an implementing bill that was full of provisions that had nothing to do with trade. One in particular was an incredible multimillion-dollar handout for a few telecommunications companies. It had no reason to be in that bill. It was strictly special interests, and some would say really special interests because of their links to certain people in the administration.

These additional provisions could not be removed, because of the fast-track rules. Members of Congress in both Houses were powerless to act against this abuse of the fast-track procedures.

Mr. President, most of us remember these events very clearly. We explicitly warned the administration at the time that stretching the fast-track rules to the breaking point would jeopardize reauthorizing fast-track in the future.

Well, Mr. President, as they say, the future is now. I do not believe Congress should extend new fast-track authority until we have had an adequate cooling-off period following the 2 recent major trade agreements and until there is no possibility that the fast-track procedures can be abused. I also believe this is the view of the majority of the American people, and I happen to believe it is the majority of those of us in the Senate on each side of the aisle.

The American economy is the most innovative, most technologically advanced and most productive economy in the world. I want to keep it that way. I want to make sure American goods, commodities, and services get a fair opportunity in the world marketplace. I want to tear down unfair trade barriers and make it clear to our trading partners that unfair trade practices that harm American companies and

jeopardize American jobs will not be tolerated.

Mr. President, we do have an obligation to set a higher standard for the world in the matter of trade relations and economic policy. And in discharging that obligation, we must never give in to the temptation to sacrifice real gains for mere appearances.

We do have an obligation to demonstrate to our trading partners our seriousness of purpose in bringing about a more open world trading system.

But this is not achieved through a haphazard rush to sign more trade deals with more countries as quickly as possible. Trade agreements are not trophies. A policy that treats them as trophies is wrong and is not in the best interests of America or of working Americans.

ORDER FOR RECORD TO REMAIN OPEN UNTIL 5 P.M. TODAY

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committees have until the hour of 5 p.m. today to file any legislative or executive matters, and further, that the RECORD remain open until 5 p.m. today for the introduction of bills and statements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MAKING MAJORITY APPOINTMENTS TO THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY AND THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 192, submitted today by this Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 192) making majority appointments to the Joint Committee on the Library and the Joint Committee on Printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DOLE. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

So the resolution (S. Res. 192) was agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 192

Resolved,

The following are named majority party members on the part of the Senate to the Joint Committee on the Library: Mr. Hatfield (chairman), Mr. Stevens, and Mr. Warner.

The following are named majority party members on the part of the Senate to the Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. Warner (vice chairman), Mr. Hatfield, and Mr. Cochran.